

Learnedisms in Costas Taktsis's *Third Wedding*¹

KOSTAS KAZAZIS

Every language one can think of, probably including those of preliterate societies, contains learnedisms – very roughly what the French call *mots savants*. In the case of Modern Greek, learnedisms are traditionally attributed to the influence of *katharevousa*. This may or may not be entirely true: much depends on one's definition of the term *katharevousa*. When it comes to Greek, I prefer the English word *learnedism* to *mot savant*, since the items we shall be discussing below involve more types of learned elements than we find in the classical opposition of *mot savant* vs. *mot populaire*, e.g. *ecclésiastique* vs. *église*, respectively. Some have claimed that the Modern Greek situation is no different from the state of affairs in other literate societies.² The argument goes that, if we declare that modern Greece and Cyprus are characterized by a state of diglossia,³ then we should be prepared to label France, Germany, Britain,

1. An earlier version of this paper was read at the joint session of the American Philological Association and the Modern Greek Studies Association in Atlanta, Georgia, on 30 December 1977. An even earlier and substantially different version was presented in a lecture sponsored by the Department of Classics of The Ohio State University in April 1977. I am indebted to George Thaniel for commenting critically on the Atlanta version of the paper.

2. Cf. George I. Kourmoulis, *Ἡ ἐπίσημος γλῶσσα τοῦ ἔθνους*, 2nd ed. (Athens, 1949).

3. This term is defined as follows in Charles A. Ferguson, 'Diglossia' (*Word*, XV (1959), 325–40): '[Diglossia is] one particular kind of standardization where two varieties of a language exist side by side throughout the community, with each having a definite role to play.'

Spain, etc., also as diglossic countries. Although there are undeniable merits to viewing diglossia as more than a simple black-and-white matter, I doubt that many linguists would be willing to subscribe to a point of view which considers contemporary France fully as diglossic as, say, Greece or Morocco. Much as this topic seems to be worth pursuing, it clearly transcends the scope of this paper, and we shall now turn to more pertinent matters.

Learnedisms abound in everyday Greek urban discourse. On the other hand, literary demotic has on the whole tried to avoid them. Although this avoidance of learnedisms is understandable if one keeps in mind that literary demotic has been for a long time eminently militant and has even been used as something approaching a language-teaching device, the fact still remains that a linguistically sensitive reader is sometimes aware of the artificiality of the normalized, almost-totally-free-from-learnedisms kind of demotic which he finds in the utterances of educated urban characters in, say, the novels of Nikos Kazantzakis, Ilias Venezis, and, more recently, Evangelos Averoff-Tossizza. Sure enough, there has been a reaction to the dogmatic and partly unrealistic language of the militant demoticists.⁴ We find such a reaction in the writings of the surrealist poet Andreas Embeirikos – to mention just one name from the interwar period⁵ – and also in a probably increasing number of younger writers, Costas Taktis among others.⁶

In July 1973 George Savidis, one of Greece's foremost literary scholars, complimented Taktis in my presence for 'having freed the Greek language from the tyranny of the demotic'. Being but a benighted linguist, I had not yet at that time read anything by Taktis, but as it turned out later I had correctly interpreted Savidis's remark as meaning that Taktis had made considerable concessions to Greek as it is really spoken and had not limited

4. Cf. Kostas Kazazis, 'A Superficially Unusual Feature of Greek Diglossia', *Papers from the 12th Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society* (Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 1976), pp. 369–73.

5. See E. Kriaras, 'Συρραλισμός και δημοτική', *Νέα Έστια*, Vol. 100 (15 July 1976), 919–21).

6. The name is *Ταχτσής*, but it appears as *Taktis* in the English translation of his novel *Τό τρίτο στεφάνι: The Third Wedding*, translated by Leslie Finer (London, 1967).

himself to what normally passes for ‘true’ demotic in certain Greek literary circles.⁷

One of the things that struck me while reading *The Third Wedding*⁸ – apart from its being a delightfully faithful portrait of some facets of modern Greek society – was that Taktis uses an enormous amount of learned material in that novel. One finds unstressed internal augments, as in ἀπεφάσισα (11; but also ἀποφάσισα [33], without an augment); learned consonant clusters abound, as in the form λεπτά for ‘money’ (37), although in most cases we do find λεφτά in that sense; there are large numbers of fancy single words like νυχθημερόν (28), although Taktis does not shun the non-learned μέρα-νύχτα; the book is teeming with fancy grammatical forms, many of them historical tenses of medio-passive verbs, like ἀνεμίχθην (116); and there are hundreds of sometimes partly demoticized groups consisting of more than one word and including collocations,⁹ clichés, puristic idiomatic expressions, classical or biblical sayings, mottos, proverbs, and so on: e.g., ἔκτρωμα τῆς φύσεως (9), ἰδίους ὀμμασι (25), διέρρηξα τὰ ἱμάτιά μου (93), μάχαιραν ἔδοσες, μάχαιραν θὰ λάβεις (131), ‘ἄλλαι αἱ βουλαι ἀνθρώπων ἄλλα ὁ θεὸς κελεύει’ (140; in quotes in Taktis’s text), ὁπῶς ἀπεδείχθη ἐκ τῶν ὑστέρων (233).

I do not propose to engage here in a detailed taxonomy of the various types of learnedisms found in *The Third Wedding*, but it might be worth mentioning that several of the items which I have relegated to the wastebasket category which includes collocations, frozen expressions, quotations from the Scriptures, and the like behave very much like single lexical items in Modern Greek. This is also the case in English with, for

7. Cf. Kazazis, op. cit.

8. *Τὸ τρίτο στεφάνι* was first published in 1962. The page numbers (in parentheses) refer to the fifth edition (Athens. Hermēs, 1974). The term ἔκδοσις, however, as in πέμπτη ἔκδοσις, often refers to a *printing* rather than to what is usually understood by *edition* in English.

9. ‘Collocation simply means the “placing together” of two or more words or phrases. In this sense “darling Mummy” or “bad man” are collocations, as is also “deleterious toadstools,”’ J. F. Wallwork, *Language and Linguistics: An Introduction to the Study of Language* (London, 1969), pp. 93–4. According to Householder, a collocation is ‘a particular semi-idiomatic combination of words,’ Fred W. Householder, *Linguistic Speculations* (Cambridge, 1971), p. 341.

instance, *to look up* (as in *I looked it up in the OED*), *to kick the bucket*, *believe it or not*, *to say the least*, *I'm (etc.) sick and tired of, lots of, I (etc.) couldn't care less*, and so on. I am not referring merely to those instances where Modern Greek spelling allows the writing of such items as one word, as in *έξισου, έπιτέλους, τρώντι*. I am referring particularly to those cases where the modern orthography insists on writing each word separately, as in *έν μέρει, έλαβε χώραν, προς τί, δ μή γένοιτο*.

Militant demoticists typically castigate the use of what they consider as 'unnecessary' learned elements in the speech and the writings of their fellow-Greeks. They regard such 'lapses into katharevousa' as manifestations of sloppiness or lack of linguistic discipline, especially when non-demotic morphological elements are used – the ending *-ην* of *άνεμίχθην* is a case in point. One need hardly remind neohellenists that militant demoticism¹⁰ viewed the elimination of so-called 'unnecessary' learned elements as a categorical imperative for those members of the Greek intelligentsia who are not linguistically 'reactionary'. They are the intellectual leaders of their people, and consequently they should both learn Greek from the folk and at the same time teach the folk how to avoid the macaronic abominations of the *καθαρευουσιάνοι*. Their vigilance should therefore never be allowed to slacken.

Taksis is linguistically on the whole fairly consistent. For instance, he uses only the form *λεπτά* (never *λεφτά*) in the meaning 'minutes' (101 and *passim*). He uses the forms *άδερφός* and *άδερφή* for 'brother' and 'sister' throughout his book, except once (as far as I could see) where he writes *άδελφός* (66) for no apparent contextual reason. He does write the forms with *-λφ-* when the context requires it, as when some speakers are on their best linguistic behaviour (168). In the meaning 'nurse', he consistently (and correctly) writes *άδελφή* (83 and *passim*).

Nevertheless, even Taksis's numerous vacillations are not, in

10. By 'militant demoticism' I mean not only what Professor George Babinotis, of the University of Athens, labels 'psycharism' or 'old demoticism' but also what he calls 'demoticism,' i.e. the movement whose leading figure was Manolis Triandaphyllidis. Babinotis used those terms in his paper 'A Linguistic Approach to the Language Question in Greece', read at the joint session of the American Philological Association and the Modern Greek Studies Association in Atlanta, Georgia, on 30 December 1977, and printed in this present volume of *BMGs*.

my opinion, to be attributed to carelessness on his part.¹¹ They are, I believe, a true reflection of the vacillations one finds in real Modern Greek discourse, even in the speech of the same person and even during the same speech event: we read, for example, both οὕτως ἢ ἄλλως (53 and *passim*) and ἔτσι κι ἄλλιῶς (54 and *passim*); both ἐν τῷ μεταξύ (34 and *passim*) and στὸ μεταξύ (27 and *passim*); both δυνατόν/ἀδύνατον (νά) (15, 25, and *passim*) and, less often, δυνατό/ἀδύνατο (νά) (23, 130, and *passim*); both ἐξήτασα (199), ἀνήγγελλε (201), as well as ἀπάγγελλε (imperfective past [=imperfect], 42), and παράγγελλε (ditto, 48); both εἶμαι (etc.) εἰς θέσιν νά (16 and *passim*) and εἶμαι (etc.) σὲ θέση νά (14 and *passim*) – I must admit that I find the phrase with εἰς θέσιν more spontaneous and easier to swallow than its demotic translation σὲ θέση.¹² Taksis does, incidentally, make heavy use of katharevousa when he quotes what is being said at court proceedings (165ff.), when he has members of the legal profession talking (86), school principals addressing the parents of their pupils (98), and, of course, when someone is being sarcastic. An example of the latter use of katharevousa is when kyra-Ekavi, one of the protagonists in *The Third Wedding*, gets so irritated at her landlord's wife that she lifts her dressing-gown, breaks wind in the direction of her landlady, and says: Ἰδοὺ ἡ ἀπάντησίς μου, κυρία Μαργαρίτη μου, καὶ εἰς τὴν μητρικὴν σὰς γλώσσα! (114). Note, however, that these are 'special cases': what is striking in Taksis's novel is the realistic use of learnedisms in perfectly neutral contexts, in which it is doubtful that the author is after some special effect. To give just one example: Taksis uses quite consistently the learned nominative and accusative plural endings (-αὶ and -άς, respectively) of

11. To the best of my recollection, there were only two differences worth mentioning between Taksis's Greek in *The Third Wedding* and my own native variety of Athenian. The first was his consistent use of τοιμάζω/τοιμάζομαι (70 and *passim*), without initial ἐ-, where I have ἐτοιμάζω/ἐτοιμάζομαι. The second was his use of the forms μπόμπα/μπόμπες (192 and *passim*), where I have βόμπα/βόμβες – for me, μπόμπα is stylistically marked: I think of it as somewhat facetious, or, if the context warrants such a judgement, as slightly uneducated. Taksis does, however, use βόμπα in the collocation ἐμπρηστικὴ βόμπα (232).

12. By this last remark I by no means wish to question the correctness of the demoticist claim (beginning with Psycharis, if I am not mistaken) that a great many nineteenth-century katharevousa turns of speech were themselves literal translations of similar phrases in the major west European languages and to that extent 'un-Greek.'

isosyllabic masculine nouns in -ής. Thus, he writes *νὰ μὴν πετάω ἄδικα λεφτὰ γιὰ προγυμναστάς* (64), *λησταί* (74), *παραθερισταί* (75), *οἱ δικασταί* (87), *μήπως λίγους ἐραστὰς εἶχες καὶ σύ;* (128), *οἱ κομμουνισταί* (308), etc. Apart from the form *συμμαθητές* on page 51, for which I cannot account on stylistic grounds, the only -ές ending that I noted in the plural of such nouns was on page 296, where Taktis writes *ἔκανε νόημα στοὺς 'συναγωνιστές'*, and where *συναγωνιστές* is in quotation marks in order to indicate that this is the way communist guerrillas talked – the scene takes place in Athens during the communist uprising of December 1944.

It is difficult to say offhand whether or not the statistical incidence of learnedisms in contemporary so-called '*καθομιλουμένη*' is exaggerated in *The Third Wedding*.¹³ I confess, though, that there was one question which I could not help asking myself all along as I was reading the book, namely whether Taktis loaded his novel with learnedisms 'just for the hell of it' or whether he actually 'heard' his characters speak in that fashion. I counted so many different learned elements, especially of the wastebasket variety I mentioned above (clichés, idiomatic phrases, etc.), that at times I suspected Taktis of engaging in a wager with himself to try and use as many such elements as possible.¹⁴ In an attempt to drive home this point, I list below a few dozen such items (the list is far from being exhaustive). Many items occur several times in the novel, so the parentheses indicate the page of the first occurrence of each item. In a number of instances, I have provided part of the contexts in which the learnedisms in question occur: *ἕτερον ἐκάτερον* (13), *ἐπ' οὐδενὶ λόγῳ* (14), *εἰς βάρος μας* (15),

13. Babiniotis refers to this form of Greek as 'Modern Greek koine', loc. cit. One should keep in mind, of course, that terms like *demotic*, *katharevousa*, and *καθομιλουμένη* are relative and designate vague and largely indeterminate areas in a continuum.

14. One might mention in passing that there is something like a precedent to this sort of thing in Modern Greek literature: Kazantzakis used his *Odyssey* also as a repository of dialectal Greek words which he hated to see disappear as a consequence of the replacement of the local dialects by the neohellenic koine. See Peter Bien, *Kazantzakis and the Linguistic Revolution in Greek Literature* (Princeton, 1972), especially chapter 7, 'The *Odyssey*, *Iliad*, and Other Writings', pp. 204ff.

προσωποποίηση τοῦ διαβόλου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (16), ἔχοντας πικράν πείρα (16), καὶ οὕτω καθ' ἐξῆς (17), πρῶτον . . . , δεύτερον . . . (21), ἀφ' ἐνός . . . , ἀφ' ἐτέρου . . . (23), ἀπειποιήθη τὴν προσφορά (27), τό ἀπολωλὸς πρόβατο (30), μέγα μυστήριον! (31), πρὸς στιγμήν (35), μέχρις ἐσχάτων (36), ἐν θριάμβῳ (44), οὐδ' ἐπὶ στιγμήν (45), ἐγὼ δὲν κατέρχομαι βεβαίως στὸ ἐπίπεδόν της (52), εἰρήσθω ἐν παρόδῳ (55), παντὶ τρόπῳ (55), τοῦ Κύριε φυλακὴν τῷ στόματί μου (56), ψυχῇ τε καὶ σώματι (57), ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον (58), μέχρι ἀηδίας (62), κακὴν κακῶς (63), βρὲ ζῶον (64), δωρεὰ ἐν τῇ ζωῇ (65), ἐν ἀποστρατεία (66), ἐπ' ἀνδραγαθία (66), ἀνελάμβανε τὴν ὑλοτόμηση μοναστηριακῶν δασῶν κατ' ἀποκοπὴν (71), τοῖς μετρητοῖς (72), τόφεραν βαρέως (72), ὅπου γῆς καὶ πατρίς (73), τὸν κώδωνα τοῦ κινδύνου (73), ἓνα καὶ τὸ αὐτό (76), ὅταν ὁ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησε τρίς (73), πίστευε καὶ μὴ ἐρεῦνα (78), ἐκώφευσα (78), ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀμοιβαίας κατανοήσεως (78), συμβουλίᾳ ἐπὶ συμβουλίῳν (79), ἐν ἀνάγκῃ (80), μέρος προδιαγεγραμμένου σχεδίου (81), ἀγωγὴ διαζυγίου ἐπὶ ἐγκαταλείψει τῆς συζυγικῆς στέγης καὶ ἀγνώστῳ διαμονῇ (85), κατὰ προτροπὴν τοῦ (86), ἐναντίον μιᾶς τόσον καταφώρου ἀδικίας (87), ἦταν τῶν ἀδυνάτων ἀδύνατον (88), ἦταν ὑπεράνω τῶν δυνάμεών μου (88), πρὸς χάριν τῶν παιδιῶν μου (88), ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς (90), ὀλίγου δεῖ καὶ θὰ τὸν τουφέκιζαν (90), κατόπιν ἐντολῆς μου (91), πρὸ πολλοῦ (91), δυὸ μέρες πρὸ τῆς δίκης (91), μόλις καὶ μετὰ βίας (94), ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ (95, *sic for ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ*), τοῦ ζητοῦσε συγγνώμην (97; the fully learned form is, of course, *συγγνώμην*), τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμο, ἀλλ' ἡ σὰρξ ἀσθενής (99), ἔγινα πῦρ καὶ μανία (100), διάταγμα περὶ ἐθελουσίας ἐξόδου τῶν παλαιῶν ὑπαλλήλων (102), δουλειὰ ἀθλητικοῦ συντάκτου (105), οἱ σχέσεις τους ἦταν ὑπὲρ ποτε καλές (105), περὶ τίνος ἐπρόκειτο (105), ἐν ὀλίγοις (108), ἐπεδείξατο μετάνοιαν καὶ ἀρίστην διαγωγὴν (109), μιὰ ὥρα ἡ πρωία (114), ἐπὶ τόπου (118), πρὸς μεγάλην μου ἐκπληξιν (119), σάν τὸ πῦρ τῆς κολάσεως (122), μέσῳ ἐμοῦ (129), νὰ σκεφτοῦμε μαζὶ περὶ τοῦ πρακτέου (129), ἐξ ἐνστίκτου (130), ἐκ πείρας (136), αὐτὸ πᾶν εἶναι ἄνω ποταμῶν (136), πρὸς τὸ παρόν (140), στὰ χαρτιά ἐξακολουθοῦσε νάναι ἡ νόμιμος χήρα τοῦ (150), ὑπὸ τὰ ὄμματα τοῦ καταστηματάρχῃ (153), ὑπὸ τὸν ὄρον . . . ὅτι . . . (155), ἐν τῇ ἀφελείᾳ μου (155), ὑπὸ τύπον δανείου (156), θὰ σὲ στείλω συνοδείᾳ (160), εἶχε ἐκ θεοῦ τὸ χάρισμα νὰ . . . (163), διὰ τοῦ ὑπνωτισμοῦ (163), ἔπνεαν μένεα ἐναντίον τοῦ (165), μήνυση ἐπὶ μοιχείᾳ (167), κεκλεισμένων τῶν θυρῶν (170), εἰς ἐνδειξιν ὑπερτάτης ἀδυναμίας

(172), θά κρίνει κατά συνείδησιν (173), ἀγρὸν ἡγόραζε (174), ἔστω καὶ μετὰ θάνατον (175), κινούμενος ἀπὸ αἰσθημα φιланθρωπίας (175), νὰ κηρύξουν τὸν Γκάτσο ἐνοχο φόνου ἐκ προμελέτης μ' ἐλαφρυντικά (177), λύονται διὰ μιᾶς ὅλα της τὰ προβλήματα (182), ποὺ φυλούσαμε ὡς κόρην ὀφθαλμοῦ (184), ἐξ αἰτίας τοῦ χαρακτήρος της (187), ἐναντίον τοῦ Ἀζονος (188), μᾶς εἰδοποιούσαν ἐκ τῶν προτέρων διὰ τοῦ τύπου (189), ὡς διὰ μαγείας (190), διεκόπτοντο μέχρι νεωτέρας διαταγῆς (192), οὐδὲν κακὸν ἀμιγὲς καλοῦ (193), αἰτιάσο ἀδίκως τὸν ἑαυτό σου (200), ἐν καιρῷ εἰρήνης (201), σ' ἓνα στρατιωτικὸ νοσοκομεῖο τῶν Πατρῶν (206), ἂν φτάσουμε στὸ νῦν καὶ αἰεὶ (208), εἰς μάτην τούλεγα καὶ τοῦ ξανάλεγα πῶς . . . (208), ἀπόμεινα σὰ στήλη ἀλατος (209), ἔνα σπρωξίδι ἄνευ προηγούμενου (211), ἔγινε βεβαιότης (212), εἰς βοήθειαν τῶν μακαρονάδων (218), ἀντὶ ἄλλης ἀπαντήσεως (220), ὅλα θὰ πᾶνε κατ' εὐχὴν (221), γιὰ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια (222), κι ὡς ἐκ συμφώνων, πέσαμε στὰ γόνατα (232), νὰ σοῦ πεῖ τί ἐστὶ Χίτλερ (236), νὰ τῆς δείξω, ἔστω καὶ ἐμμέσως (237), δὲν ξέρουμε τί μᾶς ἐπιφυλάσσει ἡ αὔριον (239), ἔφυγαν ἄρον-ἄρον (239), μιὰ μέθοδο ἀγγλικῆς ἄνευ διδασκάλου (239), τῆς διηγήθηκα ἐν λεπτομερείᾳ (242), τὸ διέλυαν εἰς τὰ ἐξ ὧν συνετέθη (242), νὰ ἐπαναστατεῖ κατὰ τῆς τυραννίας της (250), εἰς πείσμα τῶν πάντων (257), ἡ κατάστασις αὐτὴ δὲν εἶναι δυνατὸν νὰ διαρκέσει ἐπ' ἄπειρον (262), τὰ φεγγάρια τοῦ μέλιτος (263), ἀνθρώπους ποὺ ὡς τότε ἤξερα μόνον ἐξ ὀνόματος (264), τὴν ἡμέρα τοῦ συμβάντος (265), ἔπνεε τὰ λοιπὰ (265), βεβαίως ἀνέκαθεν θαύμαζα τὸ λέγειν της (266), οὐδὲν κρυπτὸν ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον (276), ἦταν πιά τετελεσμένο γεγονός (276), ἦταν συσσώτιο πείνης (277), μακρὰν τοῦ νὰ χαρεῖ (281), ἀδυνάτου κράσεως (283), ἐν τούτοις (285), δόξα σοι ὁ θεός (290), οἱ νεκροὶ δεδικαίωνται (303), ὄνειρα θερινῆς νυκτός (309), δὲ μ' ἀξιώνει καὶ ἀπαντήσεως (312).

The principal characters of *The Third Wedding* are two women: Nína, who is also the narrator, and kyra-Ekávi. Nína was born at the beginning of this century, whereas kyra-Ekávi must have been born around the 1880s. I'd say they are both middle-class women, although there are some vague indications that kyra-Ekávi may be of lower-middle class origin (cf. p. 266). It should be emphasized, however, that whatever those indications may be they have nothing to do with kyra-Ekávi's linguistic behaviour. Both women, when upset, are capable of using a juicy, and occasionally folksy, version of the vernacular,

but they are also perfectly at home in typical middle-class *καθομιλουμένη*, replete with the type of learned elements mentioned earlier.

We might ask whether it is necessary to assume that these two women have had a great amount of formal education in order to be able to master so much 'katharevousa'. Although at least Nina did get her high-school diploma (*ἀπολυτήριο γυμνασίου*), neither woman is in any way educated to the extent that so many urban Greek women are today. I went through the first fifty-seven pages of *The Third Wedding* underlining all those elements, whether learned or not, which could be construed as collocations, frozen expressions, clichés, and in general as ready-made. It turned out that I had to underline roughly one half of the text. Fred W. Householder has written that there is relatively little that is linguistically novel in what we say in our everyday lives.¹⁵ He was trying to dampen somewhat the fascination which some linguists, beginning in the late 1950s, felt with the supposedly wonderfully novel character of the utterances which people produce in their lives. Even though admittedly 'further research' into this question would not hurt, there is very little doubt in my mind that Householder was right. In fact, I submit that collocations, clichés, etc., play such an important rôle in everyday oral and written discourse that the great majority of the learnedisms in *The Third Wedding* do not necessarily require an awful lot of formal education. I include

15. See his review of Ronald W. Langacker, *Language and Its Structure. Some Fundamental Linguistic Concepts* (New York, 1968), in *Language* 45.4 (1969), 886–97, especially pp. 888–9, as well as op. cit., p. 131 and *passim*. It will not come as a surprise to those familiar with certain types of bilingualism that I have recorded a great many Greek ready-made phrases in the Arvanitika dialects of Albanian spoken in Corinthia, such as *ἐν τῷ μεταξύ, ἐν πάσῃ περιπτώσει, γιὰ νὰ μὴν τὰ πολυλογοῦμε, βρὲ τὸν κερατὰ*, etc. A specific example is *bišja e pŕiftit embasiperiptosi u martua* 'at any rate the priest's daughter got married'. Note that this is not an instance of code switching (from one language to another), just as we do not switch codes in English when we say *ad nauseam, de facto, par excellence*, and the like. In Arvanitika, *ἐν πάσῃ περιπτώσει* behaves like a single item *embasiperiptosi*. In monolingual contexts, this is also known as 'automatization': 'We thus call automatization what, in the case of phrases, is sometimes called the lexicalization of phrases,' Bohuslav Havránek, 'The Functional Differentiation of the Standard Language', in *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure, and Style*, selected and translated from the original Czech by Paul L. Garvin (Washington, 1964), p. 10.

here those items which would seem to betray a solid knowledge of katharevousa grammar, such as the internal unstressed augments and personal endings which we find in forms like *ἀνεκάλυψα* (20), *ἀπελάμβανε* (29), *ἐνεθάρρυνα* (208), *μ' ἐξελεύριζαν* (253), *συνεβούλευσε* (43), *συνεκρούσθη* (46), *ἀπεπειράθη* (53; but *ἀποπειράθηκε* on p. 303), *ἀπεφασίσθη* (105).

Middle-class urban Greeks have been hearing (and reading) such forms for so long that many of them may very well learn them as special items, that is, without necessarily mastering the rules of the system to which those forms belong. Thus, many Athenians may learn *συνεκρούσθη* and its plural counterpart *συνεκρούσθησαν* in more or less the way they learn that, say, *οἰκοδόμος* (or *χτίστης*) means 'bricklayer'.¹⁶ The failure to learn the rules, for instance, of when to use internal augment in verbs of learned origin often results in the well-known type of overcorrection where the augment is used also in the imperative, as in *ἐπέμενε καὶ θὰ πετύχεις* – for *ἐπίμενε καὶ θὰ πετύχεις*. Surely most neohellenists can cite instances of not terribly well-educated people peppering their speech or their writings with learnedisms, with varying success. To limit ourselves to the consonant clusters *σχ* and *σκ*, we are sometimes treated to hyperurbanisms like *σχολιώσις* (for *σκολίωσις*), *σχέφθηκα* (for *σκέφθηκα*), and even *σχέτο* (for *σκέτο*) – I read *σχέτο* in a shop-window in Athens in August 1973, and I know a middle-middle class Athenian woman who consistently pronounces *σχολιώσις* and *σχέφθηκα*. Suspected affectation in behaviour, whether linguistic or otherwise, generally evokes negative feelings. At the same time, I for one cannot help sympathizing with such people. Diglossia has conditioned a number of not frightfully secure speakers into avoiding

16. In other words, there may be gaps in the paradigm for some speakers – I owe this formulation to Joseph Pentheroudakis. Although I have not run any experiments to test such a hypothesis, it is conceivable that a given speaker has something like the following paradigm, give or take a few details here and there: *ἀνεμίχθην*, *ἀνακατεῦτηκες*, *ἀνεμίχθης*, *ἀνεμίχθημεν*, *ἀνακατεῦτήκατε*, *ἀνεμίχθησαν*. In most cases, the missing items in the *ἀνεμίχθ*–paradigm will in all probability be readily comprehensible (i.e. there will be no gaps in the receptive paradigm), even though the speaker may never use them himself – that is, the gaps exist in the paradigm only as far as that speaker's *productive* use of the language is concerned.

anything that might suggest a peasant or lower-class background, to say nothing of their fear of being suspected of leftist leanings.

For some reason, the author of *The Third Wedding*, who seems to take such pleasure in playing with language, does not use overcorrections to place his characters socially, or even merely to amuse his readers. Be that as it may, and despite the mild suspicion expressed above that he may be slightly exaggerating the statistical incidence of learnedisms, Costas Taksis has given us in *The Third Wedding* a refreshingly faithful picture of what contemporary urban Greek sounds like. Prescriptive demoticists may not like Taksis's 'undisciplined' language, but I hope that few will question the linguistic realism of his novel.

University of Chicago